

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13
14 EDGAR SOLIS,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; and
18 MICHAEL BELL,

19 Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 5:23-cv-00515-HDV-JPR

[*Honorable Hernán D. Vera*]

Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION *IN LIMINE*
No. 3 TO EXCLUDE
SPECULATIVE AND
UNREASONABLE SUBJECTIVE
FEARS**

Hearing on Motions *in Limine*:

October 1, 2024 at 09:00 a.m.

Final Pretrial Conference:

October 8, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.

Jury Trial

October 29, 2024 at 09:00 a.m.

Ctrm: 10D

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Having reviewed Plaintiff's Motion *in Limine* No. 3 to Exclude Speculative Beliefs and Unreasonable Subjective Fears, and GOOD CAUSE appearing therein, Plaintiff's Motion is HEREBY GRANTED that it is excluded from evidence, testimony, argument, or reference at trial any information related to the following:

a) Whether Plaintiff was fleeing from a felony that threatened death or serious bodily injury. The Court finds that there is no evidence that Plaintiff was fleeing from a felony that threatened death or serious bodily injury.

b) Whether some unknown bystander in some unknown location would potentially be threatened at some unknown time in the future. Given that Defendant Officer Bell did not see any bystander and did not know of the location of any bystander, and did not know of any threat to an unknown bystander by Plaintiff, that Plaintiff had not attempted to harm any bystander or attempt to go into any door or window, any inference of a threatened bystander is excluded.

The basis for this order is that information specified herein is irrelevant to liability and damages, and/or unknown to Defendant Officer Bell; or otherwise any probative value is substantially outweighed by the risk of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, wasting time, and misleading the jury; this information constitutes improper character evidence; would call for speculation; and would be a produce of improper opinion. Federal Rules of Evidence, Rules 401, 403, 404, 602, 701, 702; *Glenn v. Washington Cnty.*, 673 F.3d 864, 873 (9th Cir. 2011).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

Honorable Hernán D. Vera
United States District Judge